



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,824	02/27/2004	Iraj Saniee	9-7	6962
22046	7590	08/20/2008	EXAMINER	
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR			WEIDNER, TIMOTHY J	
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.				
ROOM 2F-192			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
600-700 MOUNTAIN AVENUE			2619	
MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974-0636				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/788,824	SANIEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy J. Weidner	2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 5,6,11 and 12 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/23/08 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1 and 2 are currently amended.
2. Claims 7-12 are new.
3. Claims 1-12 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 6 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: line 2 recites "step of deciding" which should be more clearly written as "a step of deciding" because there appears to be nothing in the claims to provide antecedent basis from a previous step of deciding. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim is dependent upon claim 3, while the intent appears to be dependency upon claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. (U.S. 5,742,592, herein “Scholefield”) in view of Garcia-Luna-Aceves (U.S. 2002/0167960 A1, herein “Garcia”).

9. Regarding claims 1 and 7, Scholefield teaches a method, comprising:

10. (a) at a base station scheduler (receiving node) (column 4, lines 19-21) of a communication network, receiving a request to schedule at least one timeslot of a recurrent cycle for receipt of burst transmissions (column 4, lines 14-19, 37-38; “an access request on all three timeslots ... received by the ... scheduler”) from a subscriber (sending node) (column 4, lines 17-20) of the network;

11. (b) in response to the scheduling request, selecting at least one timeslot of the cycle for receipt of burst transmissions (column 4, lines 27-29; “an allocation of only these subchannels would be made”); and

12. (c) communicating the selected timeslot or timeslots to the sending node (column 4, lines 37-44; “send back ... separate allocation messages on each subchannel”).

13. However, Scholefield may not explicitly teach selecting in a manner which is independent of timeslot selections to be made by other existing receiving nodes of the

network. Garcia, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches selecting in a manner which is independent of timeslot selections to be made by other existing receiving nodes of the network (paragraph 0030; “nodes admit new nodes for quasi-static scheduling independently of one another”) for the purpose of “allowing a new node to start using the time slots … after it receives routing messages from some or all of its neighbors”.

14. Particularly, Garcia teaches time slots of the quasi-static schedule are assigned to nodes based simply on the identifiers of other nodes (paragraph 87), i.e. not based on timeslot selections to be made by other nodes. Although the timeslot selections are expected to be the same for each node in the steady state (paragraph 88), Garcia teaches asynchronous scheduling by each node assuming a new quasi-static schedule immediately after receiving an updated node list causing different nodes to have different timeslot selections (paragraph 94). Therefore, quasi-static scheduling enables a scenario where a first existing receiving node has a schedule, a first new node enters, the first existing node updates its schedule independently, a second new node enters, and a second existing node updates its schedule independently and differently based on the first and second new nodes.

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select at least one timeslot of the cycle (Scholefield) in a manner which is independent of timeslot selections to be made by other existing receiving nodes of the network (Garcia) to allow a new node to start using the time slots after it receives routing messages from some of its neighbors.

16. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. (U.S. 5,742,592, herein “Scholefield”) in view of Garcia-Luna-Aceves (U.S. 2002/0167960 A1, herein “Garcia”) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Peterson (U.S. 6,301,262 B1).

17. Regarding claims 2 and 8, Scholefield teaches in at least one instance of the recurrent cycle at the sending node, transmitting a burst via the designated subchannels within the recurrent cycle (column 4, lines 43-46), but does not teach determining at least one time at which bursts need to depart in order to arrive at the receiving node within a selected timeslot, and transmitting a burst at least at one of the times that have been determined. Peterson, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches determining at least one time at which bursts need to depart in order to arrive at the receiving node within a selected timeslot (column 6, lines 14-24; “determines if a time slot exists in which a message may be injected ... so that it may be received ... at a time when the requested resources are receptive to receiving”), and transmitting a burst at least at one of the times that have been determined (column 6, lines 14-24; “a message may be injected”) for the purpose of solving the problem of propagation time due to distance between communications resources (column 2, lines 6-18).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to in addition to the method taught by Scholefield, determine at least one time at which bursts need to depart in order to arrive at the receiving node within a selected timeslot, and transmit a burst at least at one of the times that have

been determined to solve the problem of propagation time due to distance between communications resources.

19. Claims 3, 4, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. (U.S. 5,742,592, herein "Scholefield") in view of Garcia-Luna-Aceves (U.S. 2002/0167960 A1, herein "Garcia") as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and further in view of Padovani et al. (U.S. 6,574,211 B2, herein "Padovani") and Dail et al. (U.S. 5,570,355, herein "Dail").

20. Regarding claims 3 and 9, Scholefield teaches detecting an idle period (column 6, lines 50-51), but does not teach detecting non-receipt of a scheduled burst at the receiving side; selecting a timeslot in substitution for the timeslot of the non-received burst; and communicating the selected substitute timeslot to the sending node.

21. Padovani, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches detecting non-receipt of a scheduled burst at the receiving side (column 15, lines 36-40; "missing data units are considered as though received in error") for the purpose of then transmitting NACK messages corresponding to the missing data units.

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to in addition to the method taught by Scholefield, detect non-receipt of a scheduled burst at the receiving side to then transmit a NACK message corresponding to the missing data units.

23. Dail, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches selecting a timeslot in substitution for the timeslot of the non-received burst (column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-4; "a 'hole' ... is taken account of by 'repacking', which refers to reallocation of

time slots to existing calls"); and communicating the selected substitute timeslot to the sending node (column 4, lines 13-17; "stations are notified of the new ... time slot allocations by sending messages") for the purpose of adapting to the changing demands of a mix of STM and ATM applications (column 2, lines 53-57).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to in addition to the method taught by Scholefield and modified by Padovani to select a timeslot in substitution for the timeslot of the non-received burst, and communicate the selected substitute timeslot to the sending node to adapt to the changing demands of a mix of STM and ATM applications.

25. Regarding claims 4 and 10, Scholefield teaches deferring completion of a first data transfer for a higher priority data transfer (column 5, lines 47-54), but does not teach the selection of a substitute timeslot. Dail teaches selecting a substitute timeslot that has already been scheduled as in the instant invention alternative (column 4, lines 1-2; "reallocation of time slots to existing STM calls") for the purpose of adapting to the changing demands of a mix of STM and ATM applications.

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to in addition to the method taught by Scholefield and modified by Padovani and Dail to select a substitute timeslot that has already been scheduled to adapt to the changing demands of a mix of STM and ATM applications.

Allowable Subject Matter

27. Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shachar et al. (US 7009991 B2) teaches timeslot reservations are independent of other timeslot reservations in an optical ring network. Rogers (US 6556564 B2) teaches schedules for reception are independent at each switch. Raychaudhuri (US 4504946) teaches a receiver with timeslot selection independent of timeslot selection by other receivers in a satellite system.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Weidner whose telephone number is (571) 270-1825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy J Weidner/
Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/CHAU T. NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619